REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-10 are pending of which the claims 1 and 5 have been amended and the claims 4 and 8 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer in order to more explicitly describe the claimed invention. It is believed that no new matter adds by way of amendments made to the claims. For at least the foregoing reason, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-10 patently define over prior art of record and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Discussion for amendments to claims 1 and 5

Independent claims 1 and 5 are so amended to merger their respective dependent claims 4 and 8 and add a recitation, "the first adhering region is affixed to the second adhering region after one end of the strap unit passes through the ring." This recitation is supported in paragraph [0021] in the specification.

Discussion for rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

2. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 5,312,431 to McEwen(hereinafter referred to as "McEwen).

In response thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejection based the following arguments. To establish a prima facie case of anticipation, the cited reference (i.e. McEwen) should teach all limitations of the amended claim 1. However, from Fig.4 and Fig.7, in McEwen, the reference numeral 108 is not a strap unit as alleged but a label (see col., 14, line 34) because its one end does not pass through a ring 100. In other words, the reference numeral 108 fails to disclose "the strap unit is adapted to pass through the ring," as claimed in the claim 1.

Furthermore, from Fig.7, in McEwen, the reference numeral 108 is used as "marking "for restricting use of the cuff to properly trained staff, etc., (see col. 14, lines 32-39), not used to wrap an arm of a subject. This is because the reference numeral 108 has no a first adhering region and a second adhering region and the first adhering region is affixed to the second adhering region after one end of the strap unit passes through the ring. Thus, McEwen fails to teach, suggest or disclose "**the strap unit is adapted to pass through the ring and a first adhering region and a second adhering region, wherein the first adhering region is disposed on a surface of the strap at one end further away from the ring than the second adhering region, the second adhering region is disposed on the surface of the strap adjacent to the first adhering region and the first adhering region is affixed to the second adhering region after one end of the strap unit passes through the ring,**" as claimed in the claim 1. In other words, the claim 1 is not anticipated by McEwen, and thus patentable.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 4,901,732 to Williams in view of US Pat. No. 1,857,567 to Plesch.

In response thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejections based the following arguments. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine references teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teachings or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, nit in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438(Fed. Cir.1991). However, in Plesch, the Examiner alleged that a **first adhering region s** is disposed on a surface of the strap at one end further away from the **ring g-l, k, r** than a **second adhering region f.** Applicant respectfully disagrees the Examiner's allegation based on two reasons. The first reason is that in Plesch, reference character **g-l, k, r** is a fastener (see col.2, lines 65-85), not a "ring" because there disclose "a handle **k** is then rotated to the position shown in Fig.3, causing the rod i to squeeze the free end of the strap."(see col.2, lines 91-93). In contrast, as claimed in claims 1 and 5, the ring only functions to allow the strap unit to pass through. The second reason is that, in Plesch, a first adhering region s cannot be affixed to a second adhering region **f,** instead of "the first adhering region is affixed to the second adhering region after one end of the strap unit passes through the ring," as claimed in claims 1 and 5. Therefore, even if Williams and Plesch could be combined, this combination still fails to teach, suggest or disclose "the first adhering region is affixed to the

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 16 2007

second adhering region after one end of the strap unit passes through the ring," as claimed in claims 1 and 5. In other words, the independent claims 1 and 5 are not rendered obvious by this combination, and thus patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 2-3, 6-7 and 9-10, they should be patentable as a matter of law for the reason that they contain all limitations of their corresponding base claims 1 and 5.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-10 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 1/16/2007

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809